

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,635	SHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Dunlap	2855	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Non-Final

(1) Jonathan Dunlap.

(3) _____

(2) Steven Gruskin (Representative).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 5 July 2007

Time: 1:53

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims 7-8, 103(a)

Claims discussed:

3-8

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner initiated a telephonic interview with Steven Gruskin to discuss claims 7-8 as being product-by-process claims. Claims 3-6 were amended in a response filed on June 7, 2007 and would have been allowed in the next Office Action. To advance prosecution, the Examiner suggested that more structural details from the method claims of 3-6 should be included in the product-by-process claims of 7-8 so as to place the entire application in condition for allowance. The Examiner agreed to review a set of drafted claims for a possible Examiner's Amendment at a later date.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/518,635	SHIMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jonathan Dunlap	2855

All Participants:

Status of Application: Non-Final

(1) Jonathan Dunlap.

(3) Mark Davis (Representative).

(2) Andrew Baca (Representative).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 July 2007

Time: 12:05 pm

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

22-27

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant submitted a set of drafted claims to be entered via an Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to verify that the amendment could be entered.